IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA ANDERSON DIVISION

Shirley A. Propst,)	
)	Civil Action No. 8:05-0711-TLW
Plaintiff,)	
)	<u>ORDER</u>
VS.)	
)	
JoAnne B. Barnhart,)	
Commissioner of Social Security,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
)	

This is a social security case. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending that the Commissioner's decision be reversed under sentence four of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g), with a remand of the matter to the Commissioner for further administrative proceedings. The Report is made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2)(a), D.S.C.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

Plaintiff filed her brief on January 11, 2006. Thereafter, on February 15, 2006, the Commissioner filed a motion seeking an order of reversal and remand of the matter for further administrative proceedings. The Magistrate Judge filed her Report on May 4, 2006. No objections were filed by either party. In the absence of objections, the Court is not required to give any

8:05-cv-00711-TLW Date Filed 07/13/06 Entry Number 12 Page 2 of 2

explanation for adopting the recommendation. Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. Wright v. Collins, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th

Cir. 1985). After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the

standards set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the

judgment of this Court that the decision of the Commissioner be REVERSED under sentence four

of 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) and the matter be remanded to the Commissioner for further administrative

proceedings as set forth in the Magistrate's Report.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten

TERRY L. WOOTEN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

July 13, 2006

Florence, South Carolina